

shown that the said Dent had violated his trust as guardian, or wasted, or misapplied, the money, or property of his wards at the time of executing the deeds complained of. 2d. That the said bill shows no title, legal or equitable, on the part of the complainants to impeach the said deeds. 3d. That said bill does not show the complainants to be remediless at law in the premises. 4th. That the complainants do not show that they have obtained a legal or equitable lien on the property conveyed, they being only stated to be creditors at large of the said Dent. 5th. That the said bill does not contain a prayer for the sale of the property conveyed.

It appeared by the proceedings, that Zachariah Dent, the grantor in the deeds, petitioned for the benefit of the insolvent laws on the 23d of October, 1844, exhibiting with his petition a list of his creditors, of whom the heirs of Benjamin Swan were returned as creditors to the amount of \$2900, and that upon allegations filed against him by John Hughes, the present guardian of the complainants, the jury found that he had made voluntary and fraudulent transfers of his property prior to his application, and upon this finding, his petition was dismissed. The defendant, George T. Richards, was appointed the trustee of the petitioner at the time of his application, but no property of any description was returned by him. It also appeared by a copy of the proceedings, that George T. Richards himself, applied for the benefit of the insolvent laws in June, 1836.

Commissions were issued under which a great deal of evidence, written and oral, was collected and returned, and the case standing ready for hearing, has been submitted for decision upon written arguments filed by the respective solicitors.

Without going into any detailed statement of the proof, the Chancellor, after a very attentive reading of it, is of opinion that the merits of the case are unquestionably with the complainants, and that they are entitled to the interposition of the court in their favor, unless such interposition is prohibited by some insuperable legal or technical difficulty. The proof in my opinion establishes the following propositions.

1. That Dent is now and was indebted to the complainants,